United States District Court Southern District of Texas

## **ENTERED**

## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS CORPUS CHRISTI DIVISION

December 11, 2020 David J. Bradley, Clerk

§	
§	
§	
§ MISCELLANEOUS NO. 2:20-MC-8	71
§	
§	
§	
§	
	<ul> <li>§</li> <li>§</li> <li>MISCELLANEOUS NO. 2:20-MC-8</li> <li>§</li> <l< td=""></l<></ul>

## ORDER ADOPTING MEMORANDUM AND RECOMMENDATION

Before the Court is Magistrate Judge Jason Libby's Memorandum and Recommendation (M&R). (D.E. 2). The M&R recommends that the Court deny Plaintiff William Lee Grant II's Application to Proceed *In Forma Pauperis* (D.E. 1) because:

(1) the claims listed in the complaint are frivolous; (2) there is no connection to, or jurisdiction in, the Corpus Christi Division of the Southern District of Texas; (3) Petitioner simultaneously filed similar complaints in both the Laredo (5:20-cv-131) and McAllen (7:20-cv-232) Divisions of the Southern District of Texas; and (4) United States District Judge Andrew Hanen has previously held that, for reasons of comity, Plaintiff should not be allowed to file a civil suit in this District until he pays the fees owed in the Central District of Illinois.

(D.E. 2); see Grant v. U.S. Dep't of Def., No. 4:19-mc-1677 (S.D. Tex. June 12, 2019) (Order Denying Plaintiff's Application to Proceed In Forma Pauperis).

The parties were provided proper notice of, and the opportunity to object to, the Magistrate Judge's M&R. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); FED R. CIV. P. 72(b); General Order No. 2002-13. Plaintiff filed a "Response to [the] Memorandum and Recommendation," dated as being mailed on September 4, 2020. (D.E. 3-1). The Court construes Plaintiff's response as objections to the M&R and, after review, Plaintiff's 1/2

Case 2:20-mc-00871 Document 4 Filed on 12/11/20 in TXSD Page 2 of 2

objections are **OVERRULED**. (D.E. 3).

Having carefully examined the proposed findings and conclusions of the M&R, the record, the applicable law, and having made a de novo review of the portions of the M&R to which Plaintiff's objections were directed, 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1), the Court **ADOPTS** the M&R in its entirety. (D.E. 2). Accordingly, the Court **DENIES** Plaintiff's Motion to Proceed *In Forma Pauperis*. (D.E. 1).

SO ORDERED.

DAVID S. MORALES

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Dated: Corpus Christi, Texas December 11, 2020